



2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20037-3213
T 202.293.7060
F 202.293.7860

www.sughrue.com

FAX

Date February 4, 2005

To Examiner Hai VO

Of PTO Group Art Unit 1771

Fax (703) 872-9308

From Brian W. Hannon, Reg. No. 32,778

Subject Response Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

Our Ref Q57646 Appln No 09/487,239

Conf No 2929 Inventors: Norikane NABATA, et al.

Pages 5 (including cover sheet)

Please call attention to problems with this transmission by return fax or telephone. Thank you.

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS COMMUNICATION IS CONFIDENTIAL, MAY BE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED, AND IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE ADDRESSEE. UNAUTHORIZED USE, DISCLOSURE OR COPYING IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED AND MAY BE UNLAWFUL. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY US.

This fax filing includes:

1. This cover sheet
2. Response Under 37 C.F.R. §1.116

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

Sir:

I hereby certify that the above identified correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to Examiner Hai VO at the Patent and Trademark Office on February 4, 2005 at (703) 872-9306.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian W. Hannon

RECEIVED
COMMUNICATIONS SECTION
FEB 10 2005

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
GROUP 1771
PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q57646

Norikane NABATA, et al.

Appl. No.: 09/487,239

Group Art Unit: 1771

Confirmation No.: 2929

Examiner: Hai VO

Filed: January 20, 2000

For: LAMINATE FOR CONTAINER AND CONTAINER FOR ADSORBENT

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

MAIL STOP AF

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated November 4, 2004, please consider the remarks as submitted herewith on the accompanying pages.

REMARKS

Claims 6 and 8-12 are all the claims pending in the application.

The Examiner continues to reject claims 6 and 8-12 under § 103 as being unpatentable over Dauber et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,538,545) in view of Takiguchi, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,804,074) for the reasons presented in the previous Office Action.

Reviewing the prosecution history of this case, in the last response, Applicants argued that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to substitute the high